

REMARKS

In the August 25, 2009 Office Action, all of the claims stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the August 25, 2009 Office Action, Applicant has amended the claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9, cancelled claims 11 and 12, and introduced new dependent claims 13-19 as indicated above. Thus, claims 1-4, 8, 9 and 13-19 are pending, with claims 1 and 8 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Entry of May 20, 2009 Amendment

On page 1 and at the top of page 2, of the Office Action, the Office Action indicates that Applicant's May 20, 2009 Amendment has been entered.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,895,009 (the Stallkemp patent) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0114679 (the Domon publication). In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 8, and cancelled claims 11 and 12, as mentioned above.

Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a data conversion system in which ***one of a first node and a second node*** on an IEEE1394 bus serves as a cycle master, ***the first node being configured to transmit first data to the second node*** at a transfer rate synchronized with a cycle start packet output from the cycle master, and further requiring ***an***

external synchronizing signal receiver for receiving an external reference signal provided on at least one of the first and second nodes, a synchronization adjustment unit for synchronizing a frequency of the cycle start packet output from the cycle master with a frequency of the external reference signal received by the external synchronizing signal receiver, by carrying out feedback control of a clock source frequency of the cycle master using the external reference signal, and the second node being configured to synchronize second data generated by conversion of the first data in the second node with the external reference signal and to output the second data.

Independent claim 8 has been amended to recite a device configured to connect to an IEEE1394 bus to form one of a first node and a second node, the device including an external synchronizing signal receiver for receiving *the external reference signal* and a synchronization adjustment unit for *synchronizing a frequency of the cycle start packet output from the cycle master with a frequency of the external reference signal received by the external synchronizing signal receiver, by carrying out feedback control of a clock source frequency of the cycle master using of the external reference signal.*

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Office Action acknowledges that the Stallkamp patent fails to disclose transmitting of data “from one of the plurality of nodes to another of the node of the plurality of nodes at a transfer rate synchronized with a cycle start packet output from the cycle master”.

At the bottom of page 3 and top of page 4 of the Office Action, the Office Action alleges that the Domon publication provides disclosure that, when combined with the disclosure of the Stallkamp patent, allegedly renders the claimed invention obvious. The Office Action specifically refers to paragraphs [0017] and [0098] of the Domon Publication. However, the teachings of the Domon Publication combined with the teachings of the Stallkamp patent fail to disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Specifically, the Domon publication at paragraph [0017] teaches “overwriting a clock cycle offset values of its own cycle time register with the received time information to synchronize to the cycle master.” Paragraph [0098] of the Domon publication mentions a digital video player 220 that “decodes a digital video signal of DV format received from the IEEE1394 bus and outputs an analog video signal”.

However, both the Stallkamp patent and the Domon Publication fail to disclose or suggest a data conversion system in which *one of a first node and a second node* on an IEEE1394 bus serves as a cycle master, *the first node being configured to transmit first data to the second node* at a transfer rate synchronized with a cycle start packet output from the cycle master, and further requiring *an external synchronizing signal receiver for receiving an external reference signal provided on at least one of the first and second nodes, a synchronization adjustment unit for synchronizing a frequency of the cycle start packet output from the cycle master with a frequency of the external reference signal received by the external synchronizing signal receiver, by carrying out feedback control of a clock source frequency of the cycle master using the external reference signal, and the second node being configured to synchronize second data generated by conversion of the first data in the second node with the external reference signal and to output the second data*, as required by amended independent claim 1.

The Stallkamp patent and the Domon Publication also fail to disclose or suggest a device configured to connect to an IEEE1394 bus to form one of a first node and a second node, the device including an external synchronizing signal receiver for receiving *the external reference signal* and a synchronization adjustment unit for *synchronizing a frequency of the cycle start packet output from the cycle master with a frequency of the external reference signal received by the external synchronizing signal receiver, by*

carrying out feedback control of a clock source frequency of the cycle master using of the external reference signal.

It would NOT have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of the Stallkamp patent and the Demon publication, to enhance the communication and conversion methods of the Domon publication with the synchronization with the house reference signal of the Stallkamp patent.

Under U.S. patent law, the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does **not** make the modification obvious, unless an **apparent reason** exists based on evidence in the record or scientific reasoning for one of ordinary skill in the art to make the modification. See, KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007). The KSR Court noted that obviousness cannot be proven merely by showing that the elements of a claimed device were known in the prior art; it must be shown that those of ordinary skill in the art would have had some “apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed.” Id. at 1741. The current record lacks any apparent reason, suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create Applicants’ unique arrangement of a data conversion system.

More specifically, if the Stallkamp patent and/or the Domon publication were somehow modified to meet the claims of the present invention, it would require a complete reconstruction of the logic and controls of the Stallkamp patent and/or the Domon publication, which would destroy the teaching of the Stallkamp patent and the Domon publication.

Moreover, Applicant believes that dependent claims 2-4 and 9 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claims 1 and 8, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 2-4 and 9 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent

Appl. No. 10/595,168
Amendment dated November 5, 2009
Reply to Office Action of August 25, 2009

claims 1 and 8, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

New Dependent Claims 13-19

Applicant has added new dependent claims 13-19 by the current Amendment. Claims 13-19 depend from allowable claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable.

Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicant believes that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-4, 8, 9 and 13-19 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/John C. Robbins/
John C. Robbins
Reg. No. 34,706

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: November 5, 2009